

1 JEROME C. ROTH (State Bar No. 159483)  
jerome.roth@mto.com  
2 HOJOON HWANG (State Bar No. 184950)  
hojoon.hwang@mto.com  
3 MIRIAM KIM (State Bar No. 238230)  
miriam.kim@mto.com  
4 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
560 Mission Street  
5 Twenty-Seventh Floor  
San Francisco, California 94105-2907  
6 Telephone: (415) 512-4000  
Facsimile: (415) 512-4077  
7  
8 WILLIAM D. TEMKO (State Bar No. 98858)  
william.temko@mto.com  
9 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
355 South Grand Avenue  
Thirty-Fifth Floor  
10 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560  
Telephone: (213) 683-9100  
11 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702

12 *Attorneys for Defendants LG Electronics, Inc.,  
LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc. and LG Electronics  
Taiwan Co., LTD.*

13  
14 *Additional Moving Defendants and Counsel  
Listed on Signature Pages*  
15

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

18 This Document Relates to:

19 *Costco Wholesale Corporation v. Hitachi,  
Ltd., et al.*, Individual Case No. 11-cv-06397

21 *Sears, Roebuck and Co. and Kmart Corp v.  
Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd., et al.,*  
Individual Case No. 11-cv-05514

23 *Office Depot Inc. v. Hitachi Ltd., et al.,*  
Individual Case No. 11-cv-06276

25 *Interbond Corporation of America d/b/a  
BrandsMart USA v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.,*  
Individual Case No. 11-cv-06275

27 *P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corporation  
et al. v. Hitachi Ltd., et al.*, Individual Case  
No. 12-cv-02648

Case No. Master File No. 3:07-cv-05944-SC

MDL NO. 1917

**DEFENDANTS' JOINT NOTICE OF  
MOTION AND MOTION FOR PARTIAL  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT AGAINST  
CERTAIN DIRECT ACTION  
PLAINTIFFS ON STATE LAW CLAIMS  
LIMITED TO INTRASTATE ACTIVITY  
AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF**  
– Redacted

[[Proposed] Order filed concurrently herewith]

Judge: Hon. Samuel Conti  
Date: February 6, 2015  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Ctrm: 1, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor

3:07-cv-05944-SC; MDL 1917

1 *Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Technicolor SA, et*  
2 *al., No. 13-cv-05723*  
3  
4 *Sears, Roebuck & Co., et al. v. Technicolor*  
5 *SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05262*  
6  
7 *Office Depot, Inc. v. Technicolor, et al., No.*  
8 *13-cv-05726*  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           **NOTICE OF MOTION AND JOINT MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

2           TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

3           PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on February 6, 2015 at 10:00 a.m., or as soon as counsel  
4 may be heard thereafter, in Courtroom 1, 17th Floor, San Francisco, California before the  
5 Honorable Samuel Conti, the undersigned defendants will move the Court, pursuant to Federal  
6 Rule of Civil Procedure 56, for partial summary judgment with respect to certain state law claims  
7 of Plaintiffs Costco Wholesale Corporation (“Costco”); Kmart Corp. (“Kmart”); and Office Depot,  
8 Inc. (“Office Depot”); Interbond Corporation of America d/b/a BransMart USA (“Interbond”); and  
9 MARTA Cooperative of America, Inc. (“MARTA”) (collectively, “Plaintiffs”). Specifically, this  
10 motion seeks partial summary judgment on the following claims for relief with the exception of  
11 Plaintiffs’ Michigan state law claims against HEDUS and the Philips Defendants:

- 12           1. Costco’s Fourth and Fifth Claims for Relief under Arizona and Florida state law;  
13           2. Kmart’s Third Claim for Relief under Michigan state law;  
14           3. Office Depot’s Second Claim for Relief under Florida state law;  
15           4. Interbond’s Second Claim for Relief under Florida state law; and  
16           5. MARTA’s Second Claim for Relief under Arizona and Michigan state law.

17           This motion is based on this Notice of Motion, the following Memorandum of Points and  
18 Authorities, the Declaration of Laura K. Lin in Support of Defendant’s Motion for Partial  
19 Summary Judgment Against Certain Direct Action Plaintiffs on Due Process Grounds (“Lin  
20 Decl.”), and any materials attached thereto or otherwise found in the record, along with the  
21 argument of counsel and such other matters as the Court may consider.  
22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Dated: November 7, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

2

3

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

4

By: /s/ Hojoon Hwang

5

JEROME C. ROTH (State Bar No. 159483)

jerome.roth@mto.com

HOJOON HWANG (State Bar No. 184950)

hojoon.hwang@mto.com

MIRIAM KIM (State Bar No. 238230)

miriam.kim@mto.com

**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**

560 Mission Street, Twenty-Seventh Floor

San Francisco, California 94105-2907

Telephone: (415) 512-4000

Facsimile: (415) 512-4077

10

11

WILLIAM D. TEMKO (SBN 098858)

William.Temko@mto.com

**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**

355 South Grand Avenue, Thirty-Fifth Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560

Telephone: (213) 683-9100

Facsimile: (213) 687-3702

12

13

14

*Attorneys for Defendants LG Electronics, Inc.; LG  
Electronics USA, Inc.; and LG Electronics Taiwan Taipei  
Co., Ltd.*

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

## **QUESTION PRESENTED<sup>1</sup>**

Whether certain of Plaintiffs' state law claims based on indirect purchases are barred where the laws of the respective states only apply to anticompetitive conduct that occurred *within* that state and Plaintiffs fail to offer any evidence of such conduct?

## SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

7        Certain Plaintiffs<sup>2</sup> assert claims pursuant to the laws of states that limit the reach of their  
8 antitrust and anticompetitive statutes to conduct occurring within the state. Specifically, Plaintiffs  
9 bring state law claims under the laws of the following states that require intrastate conduct:  
10 Florida, Arizona, and Michigan. Where Plaintiffs fail to identify anticompetitive conduct within  
11 these states, their claims must fail and summary judgment with respect to these claims should be  
12 granted in favor of Defendants.

## **OVERVIEW OF CLAIMS ADDRESSED**

14 Plaintiffs are companies that purchased products containing Cathode Ray Tubes (“CRTs”)  
15 and resold them directly to consumers or through distribution channels. Plaintiffs allege that  
16 Defendants engaged in a conspiracy to fix the prices of CRTs. Along with federal law claims,  
17 Plaintiffs allege the following state law claims at issue in this motion:

- 18 1. Costco's Fourth and Fifth Claims for Relief under Arizona and Florida state law;<sup>3</sup>

19 2. Kmart's Third Claim for Relief under Michigan state law;

20 3. Office Depot's Second Claim for Relief under Florida state law;

21 4. Interbond's Second Claim for Relief under Florida state law; and

<sup>25</sup> <sup>1</sup> Lin Declaration Exhibit C describes how Defendants' motions concerning Plaintiffs' state law  
24 claims relate to one another. As Exhibit C details, the Court need not consider certain of  
Defendants' motions if it finds in Defendants' favor on other motions.

<sup>2</sup> The Plaintiffs at issue in this motion are: Costco, Kmart, Office Depot, Interbond, and MARTA.

<sup>3</sup> Panasonic Corporation, Panasonic Corporation of North America and MT Picture Display Co., Ltd. (“MTPD”) do not move with respect to Costco’s claims, as they are not named in Costco’s complaint. The SDI Defendants and Philips Defendants likewise do not move with respect to Costco’s claims because Costco does not assert any state law claims against them.

5. MARTA's Second Claim for Relief under Arizona and Michigan state law.

## **STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS**

In discovery, Plaintiffs identified the alleged anticompetitive conduct at issue by creating an “Exhibit A,” as well as by pointing to Defendants’ own discovery responses and generally referencing all documents produced by any party.<sup>4</sup> Exhibit A lists alleged anticompetitive communications by date, location, and individual participants. Plaintiffs purported to identify which Defendants were affiliated with each entry on Exhibit A, but failed to specify the particular Defendants by corporate entity. (Thus, for instance, “SDI” is one column on Exhibit A, without reference to which of the seven SDI Defendants is at issue.) [REDACTED]

Exhibit A (consistent with all of the discovery in these matters) indicates that substantially all of the alleged misconduct at issue occurred abroad. [REDACTED]

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., Lin Decl. Ex. 20 (Office Depot’s Objections and Responses to Hitachi Asia, Ltd.’s First Set of Interrogatories, Response to Interrogatory No. 1 (stating that “[e]vidence supporting defendants’ and their co-conspirators’ illegal price fixing agreement includes” various expert reports and discovery responses by others, and an Exhibit A)). The most recent supplement of this “Exhibit A” is attached as Exhibit A to the accompanying declaration of Laura K. Lin (“Exhibit A”).

<sup>5</sup> Exhibit A.

<sup>6</sup> As described in the Lin Declaration, Defendants created Exhibit B by filtering Plaintiffs' Exhibit A by location (as identified by Plaintiffs in the second column of their Exhibit A) and selecting entries that reference, or appear to reference, the United States. See Lin Decl. ¶ 4. In addition, Defendants added entries to Exhibit B based on the allegations relating to conduct in the United States as cited in the exhibits to the Rebuttal Expert Report of Jerry A. Hausman (Sept. 26, 2014). *Id.* These latter entries are designated with the letter "H" in Exhibit B. Although Plaintiffs have indicated that their evidence of anticompetitive conduct may arise from all discovery documents and responses, Defendants have not located any additional references to Plaintiffs' allegations of anticompetitive conduct in the United States.

1           **A. Plaintiffs Have Identified No Evidence of Anticompetitive Conduct  
2 Within Florida**

3           Plaintiffs have not identified evidence of any purportedly anticompetitive conduct by  
4 Defendants within Florida.<sup>7</sup>

5           **B. Plaintiffs Purport to Have Identified One Instance of Anticompetitive  
6 Conduct in Arizona Allegedly Involving Two Defendants**

7           **C. Plaintiffs Purport to Have Identified Three Instances of  
8 Anticompetitive Conduct in Michigan**

9           Plaintiffs' purported evidence does not involve any alleged anticompetitive activity by the LG  
10 Defendants, the Mitsubishi Defendants, the Toshiba Defendants, or Panasonic Corporation.<sup>12</sup> As  
11 to the SDI Defendants, Plaintiffs have [REDACTED]

12           <sup>7</sup> See Exhibit A; Exhibit B.

13           <sup>8</sup> See Exhibit A; Exhibit B.

14           <sup>9</sup> Lin Decl. Ex. 24 (HEDUS-CRT00160563 (cited in Exhibit A line 284)).

15           <sup>10</sup> Lin Decl. Ex. 21 (Deposition of L. Thomas Heiser (March 18 – 19, 2014) at 191:17-193:9).

16           <sup>11</sup> See Exhibit A (lines 857, 1075, 1346); Exhibit B (lines 857, 1075, 1346).

17           <sup>12</sup> See Exhibit A (lines 857, 1075, 1346); Exhibit B (lines 857, 1075, 1346). [REDACTED]

18           [REDACTED]  
19           See Lin Decl. Ex. 28 (MTPD-0576843).

<sup>13</sup> Further, as to defendant MTPD,

3 | [REDACTED] . 14

## **LEGAL STANDARD**

Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine issue of material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). The party moving for summary judgment has the initial burden of identifying the absence of a genuine issue of material fact. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 247-48 (1986); *In re Oracle Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 627 F.3d 376, 387 (9th Cir. 2010).

10 Where, as here, the moving party meets its burden, the non-moving party must identify  
11 facts showing that a genuine issue for trial exists. *In re Oracle Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 627 F.3d at 387  
12 (citing *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 324 (1986)). The non-moving party may not rely  
13 on the pleadings but must come forward with evidence – affidavits, depositions, answers to  
14 interrogatories, or admissions – from which a jury could reasonably render a verdict in its favor.  
15 *Id.* (citing *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 252). “The nonmoving party must show more than the mere  
16 existence of a scintilla of evidence” or “some ‘metaphysical doubt’ as to the material facts at  
17 issue.” *Id.* (quoting *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 586  
18 (1986)).

## ARGUMENT

## **I. The Applicable Laws in Florida, Arizona, and Michigan Require Intrastate Anticompetitive Conduct**

Each of the Relevant States' laws apply only to anticompetitive conduct that occurred *within* the state.

<sup>25</sup> <sup>13</sup> See Exhibit A (line 1346 (citing Robert O'Brien (Philips) Dep. at 251:20-258:2 and PTC-0004295); Exhibit B (line 1346) (citing same). See also Lin Decl. Ex. 11 (Robert O'Brien (Philips) Dep. at 251:20-258:2); id. Ex. 8 (PTC-0004295).

<sup>27</sup> <sup>14</sup> Exhibit A (line 1075 (citing Iwamoto Dep. at 45-55, 81, 262-64, 359-64); Exhibit B (line 1075) (citing same); *see also* Lin Decl. Exs. 29, 30 (Shinichi Iwamoto (Feb. 7-8, 2013) Dep. at 45:1-55:25, 81:1-25, 262:1-264:25, 359:1-364:25); Lin Decl. Ex. 28 (MTPD-0576843).

1       In Florida, indirect purchaser damages are available pursuant to the Florida Deceptive and  
 2 Unfair Trade Practices Act (“FDUPTA”). *See Mack v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*, 673 So. 2d 100  
 3 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1996). Florida courts have consistently held that FDUPTA “seeks to prohibit  
 4 unfair, deceptive and/or unconscionable practices which have transpired within the territorial  
 5 boundaries of [Florida].” *Millennium Commc’ns & Fulfillment, Inc. v. Office of Att’y Gen.*, 761  
 6 So.2d 1256, 1262 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2000) (emphasis added); 10A Florida Jurisprudence (2d Ed.  
 7 2014) § 165 (“Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act (FDUTPA) applies only to  
 8 actions that occurred within the state of Florida.”). As a result, courts interpreting Florida law  
 9 have dismissed plaintiffs’ FDUPTA claims where a plaintiff fail to “specify the location of the  
 10 conduct to make certain it occurred within the territorial boundaries of Florida.” *Five for Entm’t  
 11 S.A. v. Rodriguez*, 877 F. Supp. 2d 1321, 1331 (S.D.Fla. 2012); *see also id.* at 1330 (“FDUTPA  
 12 applies only to actions that occurred within the state of Florida.”); *Beaver v. Inkmart, LLC*, , 2012  
 13 WL 4005970, at \*3 (S.D. Fla. Sep. 12, 2012) (dismissing FDUTPA claims “[b]ecause none of the  
 14 alleged misconduct occurred within Florida”) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted);  
 15 *Carnival Corp. v. Rolls-Royce PLC*, , 2009 WL 3861450, at \*6 (S.D. Fla. Nov. 17, 2009) (noting  
 16 that “FDUTPA applies only to action that occurred within the state of Florida” and dismissing  
 17 claims based on actions that occurred outside of Florida).

18       Arizona and Michigan’s antitrust statutes similarly apply only to intrastate anticompetitive  
 19 conduct. *See Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-1402* (“A contract, combination or conspiracy between  
 20 two or more persons in restraint of, or to monopolize, trade or commerce, any part of which is  
 21 *within this state*, is unlawful.” (emphasis added)); *Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. § 445.772* (“A  
 22 contract, combination, or conspiracy between 2 or more persons in restraint of, or to monopolize,  
 23 trade or commerce *in a relevant market* is unlawful.” (emphasis added)); *Mich. Comp. Laws Ann.*  
 24 § 445.771(b) (“‘Relevant market’ means the geographical area of actual or potential competition  
 25 in a line of trade or commerce, all or any part of which is within this state.”). *See also Aurora  
 26 Cable Commc’ns, Inc. v. Jones Intercable, Inc.*, 720 F. Supp. 600, 603 (W.D. Mich. 1989) (the  
 27 Michigan antitrust law “parallels the Sherman Antitrust Act as it applies to intrastate conduct”); *In*  
 28

1       *re Digital Music Antitrust Litig.*, 812 F. Supp. 2d 390, 407 n.8 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (finding that  
 2 Michigan antitrust law requires intrastate conduct).

3              Courts interpreting similar state laws have likewise concluded that plaintiffs must identify  
 4 anticompetitive conduct *within* the state whose law they seek to apply. *See, e.g., In re Lithium Ion*  
 5 *Batteries Antitrust Litig.*, 2014 WL 4955377, at \* (N.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2014) (dismissing New  
 6 Hampshire Consumer Protection Act claim with prejudice where plaintiffs failed to identify  
 7 anticompetitive conduct within New Hampshire) (citing N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 358-A:2  
 8 (prohibiting “any unfair method of competition or any unfair or deceptive act or practice in the  
 9 conduct of any trade or commerce *within this state*”)).

10              **II. Defendants Are Entitled to Partial Summary Judgment Where Plaintiffs Fail  
                   to Identify Intrastate Anticompetitive Conduct Within the Respective States**

11              The undisputed material facts show that Plaintiffs fail to satisfy the requirements of  
 12 Florida, Arizona and Michigan law with respect to some or all Defendants. Plaintiffs have alleged  
 13 no anticompetitive conduct by any Defendant within Florida and, as a result, Defendants are  
 14 entitled to partial summary judgment on Plaintiffs’ Florida claims. *See Millennium Commc’ns &*  
 15 *Fulfillment, Inc.*, 761 So.2d at 1262 (requiring intrastate anticompetitive conduct). Similarly,  
 16 Defendants are entitled to partial summary judgment on Plaintiffs’ Arizona claims because  
 17 Plaintiffs fail to identify any alleged anticompetitive conduct by Defendants in Arizona. *See Ariz.*  
 18 *Rev. Stat. § 44-1402* (requiring intrastate anticompetitive conduct).

19              Finally, other than HEDUS and the Philips Defendants (which do not move with respect to  
 20 the Michigan claims against them), Defendants are entitled to partial summary judgment on  
 21 Plaintiffs’ Michigan claims. Plaintiffs have not identified any anticompetitive conduct by the LG  
 22 Defendants, SDI Defendants, or Toshiba Defendants in Michigan. [REDACTED]  
 23 [REDACTED]  
 24 [REDACTED]  
 25 [REDACTED]

26              [REDACTED] *See, e.g., In re Citric Acid*  
 27 *Litig.*, 996 F. Supp. 951, 958 (N.D. Cal. 1998) (holding that where there was no evidence that

28              <sup>15</sup> Exhibit A (line 1075); Exhibit B (line 1075).

1 conspiratorial action was ever discussed at individual meetings, such meetings could only be  
2 considered circumstantial evidence of conspiracy), *aff'd*, 191 F.3d 1090 (9th Cir. 1999); *In re*  
3 *Baby Food Antitrust Litig.*, 166 F.3d 112, 118 (3d Circ. 1999) (noting that competitors may  
4 exchange price information for legitimate business reasons); *Supermarket of Homes, Inc. v. San*  
5 *Fernando Valley Bd. of Realtors*, 786 F.2d 1400, 1407 (9th Cir. 1986) (same); *Market Force Inc.*  
6 *v. Wauwatosa Realty Co.*, 906 F.2d 1167, 1173 (7th Cir. 1990) ("[I]t is well established that  
7 evidence of informal communications among several parties does not unambiguously support an  
8 inference of a conspiracy.").

9       Accordingly, other than HEDUS and the Philips Defendants, Defendants are entitled to  
10 partial summary judgment on Plaintiffs' Michigan claims because Plaintiffs fail to identify any  
11 alleged anticompetitive conduct by these Defendants in Michigan. *See* Mich. Comp. Laws Ann.  
12 § 445.772 (requiring intrastate anticompetitive conduct).

## CONCLUSION

14 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectively request that this Court award partial  
15 summary judgment in favor of Defendants with respect to the following claims:

- 16 1. Costco's Fourth and Fifth Claims for Relief under Arizona and Florida state law;

17 2. Kmart's Third Claim for Relief under Michigan state law but not with respect to Kmart's

18 Kmart's Michigan law claims against HEDUS and the Philips Defendants;

19 3. Office Depot's Second Claim for Relief under Florida state law;

20 4. Interbond's Second Claim for Relief under Florida state law; and

21 5. MARTA's Second Claim for Relief under Arizona and Michigan state law, but not with

22 respect to MARTA's Michigan law claims against HEDUS and the Philips Defendants.

23

25 | Dated: November 7, 2014 Respectfully submitted,

1 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
2

3 By: /s/ Hojoon Hwang

4 JEROME C. ROTH (State Bar No. 159483)  
jerome.roth@mto.com

5 HOJOON HWANG (State Bar No. 184950)  
hojoon.hwang@mto.com

6 MIRIAM KIM (State Bar No. 238230)  
miriam.kim@mto.com

7 **MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**

8 560 Mission Street, Twenty-Seventh Floor  
San Francisco, California 94105-2907

Telephone: (415) 512-4000

Facsimile: (415) 512-4077

9 WILLIAM D. TEMKO (SBN 098858)

10 William.Temko@mto.com

11 **MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**

12 355 South Grand Avenue, Thirty-Fifth Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560

Telephone: (213) 683-9100

Facsimile: (213) 687-3702

13 *Attorneys for Defendants LG Electronics, Inc.; LG  
14 Electronics USA, Inc.; and LG Electronics Taiwan  
15 Taipei Co., Ltd.*

16 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

17 By: /s/ Jeffrey L. Kessler

18 JEFFREY L. KESSLER (*pro hac vice*)

JKessler@winston.com

19 A. PAUL VICTOR (*pro hac vice*)

PVictor@winston.com

20 ALDO A. BADINI (SBN 257086)

ABadini@winston.com

21 EVA W. COLE (*pro hac vice*)

EWCole@winston.com

22 MOLLY M. DONOVAN

MMDonovan@winston.com

23 **WINSTON & STRAWN LLP**

24 200 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10166

Telephone: (212) 294-6700

Facsimile: (212) 294-4700

25 STEVEN A. REISS (*pro hac vice*)

steven.reiss@weil.com

26 DAVID L. YOHAI (*pro hac vice*)

david.yohai@weil.com

27 ADAM C. HEMLOCK (*pro hac vice*)

adam.hemlock@weil.com

**WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP**  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, New York 10153-0119  
Telephone: (212) 310-8000  
Facsimile: (212) 310-8007

*Attorneys for Defendants Panasonic Corporation  
(f/k/a Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.), MT  
Picture Display Co., Ltd.*

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

By: /s/ Eliot A. Adelson  
ELIOT A. ADELSON (SBN 205284)  
JAMES MAXWELL COOPER (SBN 284054)  
**KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**  
555 California Street, 27th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94104  
Tel: (415) 439-1400  
Facsimile: (415) 439-1500  
E-mail: [eadelson@kirkland.com](mailto:eadelson@kirkland.com)  
E-mail: [max.cooper@kirkland.com](mailto:max.cooper@kirkland.com)

JAMES H. MUTCHNIK, P.C. (*pro hac vice*)  
KATE WHEATON (*pro hac vice*)  
**KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**  
300 North LaSalle  
Chicago, Illinois 60654  
Tel: (312) 862-2000  
Facsimile: (312) 862-2200

*Attorneys for Defendants Hitachi, Ltd., Hitachi Displays, Ltd. (n/k/a Japan Display Inc.), Hitachi Asia, Ltd., Hitachi America, Ltd., and Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc.*

# SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

By: /s/ Gary L. Halling  
GARY L. HALLING (SBN 66087)  
[ghalling@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:ghalling@sheppardmullin.com)  
JAMES L. MCGINNIS (SBN 95788)  
[jmcginnis@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:jmcginnis@sheppardmullin.com)  
MICHAEL W. SCARBOROUGH (SBN 203524)  
[mscarborough@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:mscarborough@sheppardmullin.com)  
**SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON  
LLP**  
Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (415) 434-9100  
Facsimile: (415) 434-3947

1                   *Attorneys for Defendants Samsung SDI America, Inc.;*  
2                   *Samsung SDI Co., Ltd.; Samsung SDI (Malaysia)*  
3                   *SDN. BHD.; Samsung SDI Mexico S.A. DE C.V.;*  
4                   *Samsung SDI Brasil Ltda.; Shenzhen Samsung SDI Co.,*  
5                   *Ltd. and Tianjin Samsung SDI Co., Ltd.*

6                   By: /s/ John M. Taladay  
7                   JOHN M. TALADAY (*pro hac vice*)  
8                   john.taladay@bakerbotts.com  
9                   JOSEPH OSTOYICH (*pro hac vice*)  
10                  joseph.ostoyich@bakerbotts.com  
11                  ERIK T. KOONS (*pro hac vice*)  
12                  erik.koons@bakerbotts.com  
13                  CHARLES M. MALAISE (*pro hac vice*)  
14                  charles.malaise@bakerbotts.com  
15                  **BAKER BOTT LLP**  
16                  1299 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
17                  Washington, DC 20004-2400  
18                  Telephone: (202) 639-7700  
19                  Facsimile: (202) 639-7890

20                  JON V. SWENSON (SBN 233054)  
21                  jon.swenson@bakerbotts.com  
22                  **BAKER BOTT LLP**  
23                  1001 Page Mill Road  
24                  Building One, Suite 200  
25                  Palo Alto, CA 94304  
26                  Telephone: (650) 739-7500  
27                  Facsimile: (650) 739-7699  
28                  E-mail: jon.swenson@bakerbotts.com

19                  *Attorneys for Defendants Koninklijke Philips N.V. and*  
20                  *Philips Electronics North America Corporation*

21                  FRESHFIELDS BRUCKHAUS  
22                  DERINGER US LLP

23                  By: /s/ Michael Lacovara

24                  Michael Lacovara (209279)  
25                  Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer US LLP  
26                  601 Lexington Avenue, 31st Floor  
27                  New York, NY 10022  
28                  Telephone: 212 277 4000  
                    Facsimile: 212 277 4001  
                    Email: michael.lacovara@freshfields.com

29                  TERRY CALVANI (SBN 53260)  
30                  Email: terry.calvani@freshfields.com  
31                  CHRISTINE LACIAK (*pro hac vice*)  
32                  Email: christine.laciak@freshfields.com  
33                  RICHARD SNYDER (*pro hac vice*)

Email: richard.snyder@freshfields.com  
**FRESHFIELDS BRUCKHAUS DERINGER US LLP**  
701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (202) 777-4565  
Facsimile: (202) 777-4555

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

*Attorneys for Beijing-Matsushita Color CRT Company,  
Ltd.*

FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP

By: /s/ Kathy L. Osborn

Kathy L. Osborn (*pro hac vice*)  
Ryan M. Hurley (*pro hac vice*)  
Faegre Baker Daniels LLP  
300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2700  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
Telephone: +1-317-237-0300  
Facsimile: +1-317-237-1000  
kathy.osborn@FaegreBD.com  
ryan.hurley@FaegreBD.com

Jeffrey S. Roberts (*pro hac vice*)  
Email: jeff.roberts@FaegreBD.com  
Faegre Baker Daniels LLP  
3200 Wells Fargo Center  
1700 Lincoln Street  
Denver, CO 80203  
Telephone: (303) 607-3500  
Facsimile: (303) 607-3600

Stephen M. Judge (*pro hac vice*)  
Email: steve.judge@FaegreBd.com  
Faegre Baker Daniels LLP  
202 S. Michigan Street, Suite 1400  
South Bend, IN 46601  
Telephone: (574) 234-4149  
Facsimile: (574) 239-1900

*Attorneys for Defendants Thomson SA and  
Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc.*

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

By: /s/ Rachel S. Brass  
JOEL S. SANDERS (SBN 107234)  
jsanders@gibsondunn.com  
RACHEL S. BRASS (SBN 219301)  
rbrass@gibsondunn.com  
AUSTIN V. SCHWING (SBN 211696)  
aschwing@gig@gibsondunn.com

1                           **GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP**  
2                           555 Mission Street, Suite 3000  
3                           San Francisco, California 94105  
4                           Tel: (415) 393-8200  
5                           Fax: (415) 393-8306

6                           *Attorneys for Defendant Chunghwa Picture Tubes,  
7                           Ltd. and Chunghwa Picture Tubes (Malaysia) Sdn.  
8                           Bhd.*

9                           SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (US) LLP

10                          By: /s/ Nathan Lane, III  
11                          Nathan Lane, III (CA Bar No. 50961)  
12                          Mark C. Dosker (CA Bar No. 114789)  
13                          **SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (US) LLP**  
14                          275 Battery Street, Suite 2600  
15                          San Francisco, California 94111  
16                          Telephone: (415) 954-0200  
17                          Facsimile: (415) 393-9887  
18                          E-mail: nathan.lane@squiresanders.com  
19                          E-mail: mark.dosker@squiresanders.com

20                          Donald A. Wall (Pro Hac Vice)  
21                          **SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (US) LLP**  
22                          1 East Washington Street, Suite 2700  
23                          Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
24                          Telephone: + 1 602 528 4005  
25                          Facsimile: +1 602 253 8129  
26                          Email: donald.wall@squirepb.com

27                          *Attorneys for Defendant Technologies Displays  
28                          Americas LLC with respect to all cases except Office  
29                          Depot, Inc. v. Technicolor SA, et al. and Sears, Roebuck  
30                          and Co., et al. v. Technicolor SA, et al.*

31                          CURTIS, MALLET-PREVOST, COLT & MOSLE LLP

32                          By: /s/ Jeffrey I. Zuckerman  
33                          Jeffrey I. Zuckerman (Pro Hac Vice)  
34                          Ellen Tobin (Pro Hac Vice)  
35                          101 Park Avenue  
36                          New York, New York 10178  
37                          Telephone: 212.696.6000  
38                          Facsimile: 212.697.1559  
39                          Email: jzuckerman@curtis.com  
40                          etobin@curtis.com

41                          Arthur Gaus (SBN 289560)  
42                          DILLINGHAM & MURPHY, LLP  
43                          601 California Street, Suite 1900  
44                          San Francisco, California 94108  
45                          Telephone: 415.397.2700  
46                          Facsimile: 415.397-3300

1 Email: asg@dillinghammurphy.com

2 *Attorneys for Defendant Technologies Displays*  
3 *Americas LLC*

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28